

**Technology Customer Council Meeting
Minutes of October 9, 2007**

Final

Present: Greg Wright, Steve Mosena, Kevin VandeWall, Evelyn Halterman, Rich Jacobs, Gary Kendell, Larry Murphy, Keith Greiner*

Absent: Lesa Quinn, Joel Lunde, Mark Brandsgard, Roberta Polzin

Guests: Greg Fay, Lorrie Tritch, John Hove, Laura Riordan, John Gillispie, Patsy Tallman, Diane Van Zante (recorder)

* Participating by phone

1. **Call to Order & Introduction of New Member** – Greg Wright.
Greg Wright, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. It was noted that a quorum of members was in attendance. The Council has a new member, Evelyn Halterman from the Iowa Lottery.
2. **Approve Minutes of August 14, 2007 and August 24, 2007 Meetings** – Greg Wright.
Larry Murphy moved approval of the August 14 and 24 meeting minutes; Steve Mosena seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken, unanimously approving the minutes as written.
3. **Elect Chair and Vice Chair**
The floor was opened to nominations for Council Chair. Rich Jacobs nominated Greg Wright; Larry Murphy seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken, unanimously re-electing Mr. Wright.

The floor was opened to nominations for Vice Chair. Carl Martin was the most recent Vice Chair, but is no longer eligible to sit on the Council. Greg Wright nominated Rich Jacobs; this motion failed for lack of a second. Steve Mosena nominated Gary Kendell; Rich Jacobs seconded the motion. An oral vote was conducted, unanimously electing Mr. Kendell.
4. **Elect Member for I/3 Customer Council**
At present, the Technology Customer Council has two representatives on the I/3 Customer Council, one representing large agencies and one representing medium agencies (Greg Wright and Rich Jacobs, respectively). To avoid uneven representation, there cannot be two council members from the same agency serving on a particular council. Therefore, for the Technology Customer Council to retain a member from one large and one medium agency, the options are as follows:

The Technology Customer Council includes three representatives from “large” agencies: Greg Wright, Steve Mosena, and Kevin VandeWall. Kevin cannot serve on the I/3 Customer Council as the Department of Corrections is already represented. Previously, Steve Mosena

indicated a desire to step down from the I/3 Customer Council, but he could potentially serve again (if willing), as the Department of Human Services has no current representation on the I/3 Customer Council.

The Technology Customer Council has three representatives from “medium” agencies: Evelyn Halterman, Rich Jacobs, and Lesa Quinn. Any of the three could serve, as none would constitute duplicative representation.

Greg Wright and Rich Jacobs both expressed a willingness to continue to serve, so no action is warranted at this time.

5. Update on Encryption – Greg Fay.

We have chosen WinMagic as the encryption tool for laptops and removable media. The procurement staff negotiated a three year contract (CT 3115) with a price of \$45 per license for the first year. Each agency must purchase and manage its own licenses. A WinMagic engineer was onsite for three days to conduct training; about 75 people from 32 agencies participated. When we first discussed encryption, some agencies wanted to make their own decision about a course of action. Many of those now seem to be interested in learning more about WinMagic and in trying it. There is a greater comfort level once you see how the product actually works.

While startup costs were paid by the Pooled Technology Fund, John Gillispie believes this service should be a utility. Based on a customer base of 763 users, the rate would be about \$1.78 per month per laptop. If a large number of people use the service, the cost typically goes down. For example, if we increase users by 500, the price drops to about \$1.07. The Technology Customer Council is charged with making recommendations on utilities; the decision ultimately rests with the Governor. The concept of an encryption utility is in draft form; John is seeking feedback from council members for future discussion with Mollie Anderson.

Where is the breakpoint that requires use of a second server?

It is well over the 20,000 state employees that we have.

The key is storage. The record that is stored is very small.

The Department of Human Services (DHS) has decided to implement its own encryption effort. Testing is complete and the tool is all but ready to deploy. Will DHS have to retest?

Is the current proposal for laptop encryption only?

Philosophically, a desktop isn't any different than a laptop. There is no standard that requires you to encrypt your desktop.

For \$1.78 per month, what are agencies really getting in terms of cost avoidance?

If there is no encryption technology in place at present, the agency doesn't have to have a box to run it on, doesn't have to install the encryption software, and doesn't have to back up the box regularly. Another aspect is responsibility; when an agency participates in an encryption utility, ITE is accepting a certain amount of responsibility. There are a number of indirect benefits.

If we tell agencies they have to use this service, what are we saying in terms of costs that aren't covered?

We are talking about the infrastructure component. Most of the day-to-day management changes could be handled by the agency.

How many laptops are in use?

Based on a survey from about a year ago, there were 5400 laptops.

Would this be a turnkey or are agencies taking on some of the workload?

In terms of the service offering, there are three pieces: 1) infrastructure, 2) ongoing support, and 3) implementation. In terms of implementation, the primary task is designing the package. There is likely a basic package that would work for most people. Other areas to be addressed are informing staff when and how it will happen, providing training, and trouble-shooting. Those duties may fall to the agencies. What portion gets built into the utility is still being discussed. With any utility, you want to include anything that is consistent.

What type of action are we looking for today?

Customer councils do not have the final decision on utilities, but can make informal recommendations. John is looking for some direction whether to pursue the idea and whether there is support from the Council.

There is value in having a centralized service. The question is whether there is enough value to turn it into a mandate. It is worth pursuing as a utility, but it needs to be more clearly defined what agencies are agreeing to and what they would still be doing themselves.

Encryption is required by the end of this year. We should do everything we can to achieve that goal. There is great advantage in using a consistent infrastructure. If another month or two would result in a greater comfort level with the product, it is probably worth it.

Where do the CIOs weigh in?

Opinions vary widely.

The largest number of laptops is probably found in the Department of Transportation (DOT) and the Department of Human Services (DHS). DOT and DHS are very uncomfortable pursuing this path. If an encryption utility is mandated without DOT and DHS buy-in, it will be contentious.

At what level would the big agencies be comfortable?

At a minimum, encryption should be offered as a marketplace service. If all 5000 machines take advantage of the service, the cost would decrease drastically. A base cost of \$16,000 to provide a utility service is one of the lowest in state government.

If each agency managed its own encryption service, the cost to state government would be 32 times \$16,000. By comparison, this is where you see the true cost savings of a centrally managed service.

It is unfair to have large agencies subsidize the service for small agencies. It does not always hold true that for the large agencies, it costs less. DAS shouldn't continue to impose mandates. DHS is worried about service level more than cost; will the service still be there a year from now?

6. Review August Financials -

The directory services utility shows a balance brought forward of \$5,352.00, resources of \$30,273.00, expenses \$34,978.00, resulting in a balance of \$647.00 at the end of August.

Toward the end of the last fiscal year, it appeared that the information security office utility would have money left over, but actually closed the year about \$5000 in the red. So far this fiscal year, the utility has lost ground, currently showing a negative balance of \$5,968.00. The large majority of the budget pays for staff; the utility supports two positions. PCI and encryption are moving along well. Over the next few months, more time will be dedicated to the work plan.

DHS was very pleased with the risk assessment conducted by the Information Security Office (ISO). They would be supportive of conducting risk assessments on an annual basis.

The ISO completed 44 risk assessments overall. The idea of supplementing the assessment teams with members of the CIO Security committee has merit and will be thoughtfully considered.

7. Wrap-Up and Next Meeting Date – Greg Wright.

The next Technology Customer Council meeting is set for November 13, 2007 at 1:00 p.m. Possible agenda items include review of the bylaws to align with administrative rule changes. There being no further business, the council meeting concluded at 2:08 p.m.

Minutes approved by council April 28, 2008